

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/698,453

Applicant(s)

SOEJIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Hashem Farrokh

Art Unit

2187

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hashem Farrokh. (3) _____

(2) Daniel J. Stanger. (4) _____

Date of Interview: _____

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 0.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Hashem Farrokh
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: A telephone interview initiated by Applicant, Mr. Daniel J. Stanger (Reg.# 32846), was conducted on 1/8/08. The Applicant stated that the Examiner has not considered Japanese Patent listed on the IDS filed on 12/08/04 because an English translation copy of those patents had not been provided. Applicant pointed out that in page 6 of PET.SPR filed on 11/08/04 Applicant provided a statement regarding the relevancy of the Japanese patents which provides sufficient information regarding the relevancy of those patents. Applicant requested that an initialized and signed copy of the IDS to be mailed to Applicant. Accordingly, an initialized and signed copy of relevant page the IDS is being attached.